

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: April 15, 2021

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met April 15, 2021 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, Dan Mol, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. with the following Board members present: Mike Kaczmarek, Jan Thompson, Ken Felger, Dan Bravinder and Pat Mahlberg on WebEx. Absent was Corey Tanner. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Staff. Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present.

KAMI HOLDINGS LLC - New Item

LOCATION: Approx. 45.5 acres east of Pilger Ave. NW - Part of Gov't Lot 5; South 25 acres of NW ¼ of NW ¼ Section 27, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (E. Lake Sylvia - Southside Twp.) Tax #217-000-272200; -272301 & part of -272300

Property owner: Hennepin Ave. United Methodist Church

Petitions to rezone approximately 45 acres from AG General Agriculture and S-2 Residential Recreational Shorelands to R-2a Suburban-Residential and S-2 and establish a Standard Planned Unit Development District. Also, a Conditional Use Permit for platted subdivision (six new riparian residential lots) as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.029, 155.051, 155.059 & 155.057 Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances and Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Paul Tucci & Paul Otto, Otto Associates

- A. Riley reviewed the zoning map showing it is zoned AG and planned for AG. Location is across the road from the previous agenda item. The property is developed and has buildings including a Church and a caretaker's home as noted. The proposal is to rezone to R-2a that allows five-acre lots. If that district is approved, they propose a Standard Planned Unit Development ((PUD). He explained how the Standard PUD is different than a Rural PUD and there are not bonus lots. The number is determined by the underlying zoning district and a PUD allows them to vary the dimensional and size standards. Also, an out-lot feature as shown on the Concept Plan. A left-over parcel zoned AG would retain the current "entitlement". A Standard PUD allows for more than one zoning district. Concept shows six lots and one AG lot that is the "entitlement". First the Commission should address the rezoning and if it is suitable for the R-2a zone.
- B. Otto – wanted to be clear there is a smaller parcel on the southeast corner that they are bringing into the property so that owner can make some improvements and enlarge this parcel. The buildings on the site would all be removed. On Lot 1, he envisions the house would be between the existing building and shed. Appears that is not a bluff but would have to confirm that. The PUD allows them more room up on top of the hill where this is room to build. It is in the field and leaves the trees alone. He felt this is suited and the shoreland is much different than the other parcel. The property has been used for recreational uses for the Camp. No boathouse or shared dock is proposed. Six lots are proposed and also a common space was noted.
- C. Mol opened the hearing for public comment. Riley indicated no one has given a sign to speak.
- D. Bravinder asked about two existing lots that do not have lakeshore. Is there any intention of to sell any of that? Tucci – they have not had that discussion yet. There has been some interest from some of those owners along that finger. Bravinder – if that should happen would there be adequate shoreland. Riley – would likely have enough and as a PUD the Commission could vary the standard. He warned everyone that if there is any thought of splitting anything off for other owners it could be quite cumbersome to do it after it is platted.
- E. Bravinder asked if it is at the platting stage not the rezoning? Riley – both would make it difficult. Typically, they would go through a Board of Adjustment first. Bravinder – felt it likely those two lots may want to obtain that. Otto indicated they had discussed that, to bring in another neighbor. Had discussed with Riley about a possibility of an Out lot, but that is not possible. They are already dealing with several people and trying to address the purchaser's proposal. Bravinder understood the complexity when working with a Church Board. Anticipating what might come up.

- F. Thompson clarified they are just addressing rezoning. Riley – correct. They should raise any concerns of the Plan and establishing a Planned Unit Development. Thompson – she had raised the concern that the applicant does not own the property yet, it is a concern with this one also.
- G. Riley opened the hearing for the public comment a second time and recognized Mr. Gump. Tom Gump noted the proposed development would have a lot less impact. Retreat Centers are difficult to market.
- H. Felger – asked Otto about the two or three parcels that might want to expand the lots to the west. Otto – they cannot create out lots to do that, as they would be landlocked. Felger – it has been suggested the homes would be to the north in the open ground. Asked if the soil tests have been done to determine potential building sites. Otto – those tests have not been completed and would come in with the preliminary plat. Felger – questioned setbacks. He noted people will want to build close to the lake and questioned if there is a bluff. Otto – he will have to complete the topographical survey to determine this. He felt Lot 1 does not and would have a 75’ setback; Lot 2 may need to be further back on top.
- I. Mol questioned the area not on the lake. With the rezoning could there was a road in there. Is the PUD another way to get a lot in back? Riley – would be one less lakeshore lot, unless there is a way to split off the “entitlement” first. Otto explained the 3.3-acre lot in the northwest corner is an ag split, allowed today. The biggest reason for the PUD is the frontage is 3’ short of meeting the shoreland standard. One lot is 176’ and the rest are 200’. The configuration on how the lines come together is the reason. Riley – the AG parcel should be reviewed as part of the overall request as it is not being proposed to be split out first.
- J. Thompson – the current zoning is AG, is familiar with the area and is rich in gravel. Once rezoned to R-2a that would eliminate the possibility of gravel removal. Riley – agreed that would not be allowed.
- K. Felger – understands they are not near a subdivision stage, but asked if Pilger is an easement road? Otto yes, what exists will be dedicated to the Township. Felger – suggested the road might be moved further north (where the road currently travels).
- L. Bravinder moved to recommend approval of the rezoning of approximately 45 acres (does not include the 3.3-acre AG lot) to the County Board of Commissioners from AG General Agriculture and S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands to R-2a Suburban-Residential and S-2 because the Board feels it meets the criteria laid out in the Land Use Plan and the “shoreland is especially suited for development”. Kaczmarek seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Felger asked if they want to include minimal tree removal as a condition. Bravinder felt in this case they can address it in the Conditional Use Permit.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- M. Bravinder moved to recommend approval of the rezoning to the County Board of Commissioners to establish a Standard Planned Unit Development District because it meets the criteria laid out in Section 155.059 of the Wright County Code of Ordinances. Kaczmarek seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Thompson asked for a clarification on what they are voting on. She expressed concern for any implication to the Church this might have if their buyer falls through. Bravinder – stated the applicant had informed them the properties would still be sold on the item heard previously.

VOTE: CARRIED NAY: Thompson

- N. Bravinder moved to continue the conditional use for the subdivision until June 3, 2021 for action on the rezoning by the County Board and to obtain survey work and soil borings consistent with a preliminary plat. Felger seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED, Thompson abstained